

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2-4, and 6 are amended. No new matter is added. Claim 7 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter. Claims 1, 8, and 9 were previously cancelled. Claims 2-6 and 10 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2-7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0065805 to Barnes (hereinafter "Barnes").

Claim 2

Independent claim 2 is amended herewith to further specify the claimed subject matter. The claim amendments are supported by the originally filed specification. No new matter is believed to be added.

Amended independent claim 2 patentably distinguishes over Barnes at least by reciting **"the predetermined area being determined in accordance with the obtained quantity information."** Applicants found no evidence that Barnes anticipates or renders obvious the above-identified features recited in claim 2.

The reservation acceptance system as recited in claim 2 has the advantage that a larger number of reservation can be made compared to the conventional systems, because the predetermined area from which the reservations are accepted is determined according to the available service reflected by the quantity information.

Claim 3

Independent claim 3 is amended herewith to further specify the claimed subject matter. The claim amendments are supported by the originally filed specification. No new matter is believed to be added.

Amended independent claim 3 patentably distinguishes over Barnes at least by reciting **"the predetermined area being determined in accordance with the accepted desired time for receiving the service."** Applicants found no evidence that Barnes anticipates or renders obvious the above-identified features recited in claim 3.

The reservation acceptance system as recited in claim 3 has the advantage that the system accepts more reservations from the customers needing service at later times,

contributing to increasing profits, when the predetermined area is determined in accordance with the desired time accepted for receiving the service.

Claim 4

Independent claim 4 is amended herewith to further specify the claimed subject matter. The claim amendments are supported by the originally filed specification. No new matter is believed to be added.

Amended independent claim 4 patentably distinguishes over Barnes at least by reciting that the reservation acceptance processing portion **“asks the customer whether the customer requires a temporary reservation if not performing the reservation acceptance process when it is decided that the customer is not within the predetermined area.”** Applicants found no evidence that Barnes anticipates or renders obvious the above-identified features recited in claim 4.

The reservation acceptance system as recited in claim 4 has the advantage of accepting more reservations from customers initially rejected.

Claim 5

Independent claim 5 patentably distinguishes over Barnes at least by reciting:

- an arrival possibility decision portion that decides whether or not the customer who made the request will arrive by the forecasted time of arrival in accordance with the time of arrival, the present time and new current position information of the customer that was obtained after the reservation acceptance process had been performed, and
- a cancel processing portion that performs a process for canceling the reservation related to the request information when it is decided that the customer will not arrive by the forecasted time of arrival.

The Office Action cites paragraph [211] of Barnes relative to “an arrival time forecast portion that forecasts a time of arrival when the customer whose reservation was processed by the reservation acceptance process will arrive at the provision position” and the above-identified features of claim 5 related to the arrival possibility decision portion and the cancel processing portion. In the indicated paragraph, Barnes states:

[211] The user may preorder food or drinks, as described above, and the ECCS determines the location of a food preparation center (e.g., a concession) that is reasonably close to the user's seat and, optionally, that can most easily prepare the food by the estimated arrival time (or closest thereto). The identity of the food preparation

center and/or its location is then transmitted along with a food menu to the device 101. In response to a food order, the ECCS transmits a time the user should arrive to pick up the food. Thus, such a system can reduce or eliminate waiting to enter the facility, waiting time to receive food, and counterfeit tickets.

The Office Action admits that Barnes does not anticipate the cancel processing portion. Applicants respectfully submit that Barnes in the indicated portion or the whole disclosure also does not anticipate or render obvious the arrival possibility decision portion. The arrival possibility decision portion recited in claim 5 decides "whether or not the customer who made the request will arrive by the forecasted time of arrival" based on "the time of arrival, the present time and new current position information of the customer that was obtained after the reservation acceptance process had been performed." In other words, the arrival possibility decision portion tracks the customers and updates the forecasted arrival time. Applicants found no evidence that Barnes contemplates such an update. There is no express disclosure. Further, there is no implicit disclosure, in other words there is no evidence that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Barnes to achieve the language of the claim, when Barnes is silent about tracking the customer and updating its forecast.

Since in Barnes such an update does not occur it is logically deficient to assert obviousness of the cancel processing portion. There is no evidence that Barnes system can "[decide] that the customer will not arrive by the forecasting time of arrival" to perform a cancellation.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 5 as being rendered obvious by Barnes.

Claim 6

Claim 6 is amended herewith to include the features previously recited in claim 7 which is now cancelled. The claim amendments are supported by the originally filed specification. No new matter is added.

Amended independent claim 6 patentably distinguishes over the prior art at least by reciting:

- a traffic information obtaining portion that obtains traffic information around the parking lot or from the customer who made the request, the traffic information being transmitted from an information providing portion; and
- a demand forecast portion that forecasts a future demand of the parking lot in accordance with the traffic information, wherein

- **the predetermined area is determined in accordance with the future demand.**

Applicants found no evidence that Barnes anticipates or renders obvious the above-identified features recited in claim 6.

The reservation acceptance system for accepting a reservation of a parking lot as recited in claim 6 has the advantage that the predetermined area is determined in accordance with the future demand which is forecasted based on traffic information, thereby performing reservations more efficiently and increasing profits.

Claim 10

Independent claim 10 patentably distinguishes over Barnes at least by reciting

- a service area portion that determines a predetermined area for service around the parking area based on the available parking space; and
- a decision portion which accepts parking reservation request when the customer that sent the request is within the predetermined area according to the current position information.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither determining the approximate location of the user in the parking area (disclosed in paragraph [231] of Barnes) nor a database storing available points of interest such as vendor locations limited to a predetermined area or rule based selection of the closest points of interest (disclosed in paragraphs [162], [164] and [141] of Barnes) anticipates or render obvious “[determining] a predetermined area for service around the parking area based on the available parking space” as recited in claim 10. No area is determined in Barnes.

Further, Barnes does not anticipate or renders obvious “accepts parking reservation request when the customer that sent the request is within the predetermined area according to the current position information.” The Office Action alleges that the recited acceptance is render obvious by completing a hotel reservation when a customer is within a predetermined distance from a hotel. However, in the hotel scenario described in the Office Action based on Barnes, the reservation was already accepted being merely completed. Moreover, the predetermined distance is not “a predetermined area for service” which is determined based on the available amount of service (i.e. “parking space”). Thus, the elements in Barnes do not work cooperatively in a manner similar to the elements recited in claim 10.

The parking reservation acceptance system recited in claim 10 has the advantage that a larger number of reservations can be accepted compared to the conventional systems because the predetermined area for service is determined based on the available parking space.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Aug 7, 2009

By: 
Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501